REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim to foreign priority, and for indicating that the certified copy of the priority document, Japanese Patent Application No. 2000-120476 dated April 21, 2000, has been made of record in the file.

Claims 1-21 have been examined on their merits.

Applicant herein amends claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 20 and 21. Applicant herein amends independent claims 1, 11 and 21 to recite that the user registration process uses information supplied from the company terminals of the plurality of companies supplying the software. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 2, 10, 11 12, 20 and 21 can be found, for example, in Figures 8 and 15 of the instant specification.

Claims 1-21 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

1.   Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Hecksel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,707). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-21 at least for the reasons set forth below.

To support a conclusion that a claimed invention lacks novelty under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must teach all of the elements of a claim. *Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 1986). A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). A single source must disclose all of the claimed elements arranged as in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*,

868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art. Thus, the cited reference must clearly and unequivocally disclose every element and limitation of the claimed invention.

With respect to claim 1, Hecksel et al. fail to teach or suggest receiving information specifying at least one data item that is required for user registration, extracting the specified data item from the user information stored in a database, and generating to-be-registered information required for user registration. Figures 3a-3c of Hecksel et al. illustrate the gathering of information for user registration, but Figures 3a-3c (and their accompanying text) do not teach or suggest that such information gathering is performed on the basis of specification information that is received from a software company terminal. Instead, Hecksel et al. disclose a registration program that gathers information about the user, as well as program statistics, and the registration program does not use specification information received from a vendor terminal in the performance of its registration tasks. *See*, e.g., col. 9, lines 38 to col. 11, line 55 of Hecksel et al.

Based on the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that Hecksel et al fail to disclose all of the claimed elements as arranged in claim 1. Therefore, under *Hybritech* and *Richardson*, Hecksel et al. clearly cannot anticipate the present invention as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant believes claim 1 is in condition for allowance, and further believes that claims 2-10 are allowable as well, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-10.

With respect to claim 11, Hecksel et al. fail to teach or suggest a to-be-registered information generating section that receives information specifying at least one data item that is required for user

registration, extracts the specified data item from the user information stored in a database, and generates to-be-registered information required for user registration. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Figures 3a-3c of Hecksel et al. illustrate the gathering of information for user registration, but Figures 3a-3c (and their accompanying text) do not teach or suggest that such information gathering is performed on the basis of specification information that is received from a software company terminal. Instead, Hecksel et al. disclose a registration program that gathers information about the user, as well as program statistics, and the registration program does not use specification information received from a vendor terminal in the performance of its registration tasks. *See*, e.g., col. 9, lines 38 to col. 11, line 55 of Hecksel et al.

Based on the foregoing reasons, Applicant believe that Hecksel et al fail to disclose all of the claimed elements as arranged in claim 11. Therefore, under *Hybritech* and *Richardson*, Hecksel et al. clearly cannot anticipate the present invention as recited in independent claim 11. Thus, Applicant believes claim 11 is in condition for allowance, and further believes that claims 12-20 are allowable as well, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 11. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the § 102(e) rejection of claims 11-20.

With respect to claim 15, Hecksel et al. fail to teach or suggest a computer medium with a program recorded thereon that causes a computer to receive information specifying at least one data item that is required for user registration, extract the specified data item from the user information stored in a database, and generate to-be-registered information required for user registration. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Figures 3a-3c of Hecksel et al. illustrate the gathering of information for user registration, but Figures 3a-3c (and their accompanying text) do

not teach or suggest that such information gathering is performed on the basis of specification information that is received from a software company terminal. Instead, Hecksel et al. disclose a registration program that gathers information about the user, as well as program statistics, and the registration program does not use specification information received from a vendor terminal in the performance of its registration tasks. *See*, e.g., col. 9, lines 38 to col. 11, line 55 of Hecksel et al.

Based on the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that Hecksel et al fail to disclose all of the claimed elements as arranged in claim 21. Therefore, under *Hybritech* and *Richardson*, Hecksel et al. clearly cannot anticipate the present invention as recited in independent claim 21. Thus, Applicant believes claim 21 is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the § 102(e) rejection of claim 21.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLICATION NO. 09/838,342
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q64164

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee

and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to

said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. Wilson
Registration No. 45,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 22, 2003